**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM**

**PRESENT :**

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.GIRI**

**MONDAY, THE 26TH NOVEMBER 2007 / 5TH AGRAHAYANA 1929**

**WP(C).No. 33243 of 2007(G)**
**----------**

**PETITIONER:**
**----------**

**REMA. V.P.,**
**W/O. MANGALANANDAN K.S.**
**AGED 36 YEARS, KUTTAKKARA HOUSE,**
**POST KAITHARAM, NORTH PARAVUR, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.**

**BY ADV. SRI.P.V.SURENDRANATH**

**RESPONDENTS:**
**----------**

1. **STATE OF KERALA**
   **REPRESENTED BY ITS CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVT.,**
   **GOVT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**

2. **KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,**
   **REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,**
   **PATTOM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**

3. **DISTRICT OFFICER,**
   **KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,**
   **DISTRICT OFFICE, ERNAKULAM.**

4. **THE PRINCIPAL,**
   **SSM POLY TECHNIC**
   **(SEETHI SAHIB MEMORIAL POLYTECHNIC)**
   **TIRUR, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, KERALA.**

**BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. BEJOY CHANDRAN**
**BY ADV. SRI. ALEXNDER THOMAS, SC, KPSC**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 26/11/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

*KSS*

**V.GIRI,J.**

**----------**

**W.P ( C) No. 33243 of 2007**

**----------**

**Dated this the 26th November, 2007**

**J U D G M E N T**

The dispute in this case is whether the petitioner is qualified for being considered for the post of L.D. Typist (Category No.225/2005) in terms of the notification issued by the P.S.C. One of the qualifications prescribed is a successful completion of course in Computer Word Processing at least for three months either from the K.G.T.E or one of the enumerated institutions, subsequently declared by the P.S.C. Exhibit-P8 shows that the petitioner had undergone the said course from Seethi Sahib Memorial Polytechnic stated to be established under the Canada-India Institutional Co-operation Project. It seems that the P.S.C. did not accept the same for the reason that the said certificate does not show the duration of the course as three months and refers to only the actual hours of the course. Apparently, the petitioner thereafter produced Exhibit-P10 which shows that the course was for three months. According to the petitioner the original of Exhibit-P10 was produced before the P.S.C.

After having heard the learned standing counsel for the P.S.C, this writ petition is disposed of directing the 3rd respondent to consider the originals of Exhibit-P8 and P10, verify whether the same is in terms of the notification and if so, to include the petitioner also in the rank list provided it is acceptable and the petitioner is otherwise eligible. The petitioner may produce the originals of Exhibits P8 and P10 or if the same have already been produced before the 3rd respondent, attested copies of the same may be produced along with certified copy of this judgment on or before 30.11.2007.

**(V.GIRI, JUDGE)**

ma

**K.THANKAPPAN,J**

**CRL.A. NO.92 OF 1999**

**ORDER**

**25th May, 2007**